

JON M. HUNTSMAN, JE Governor

> GARY R. HERBERT Lieutenant Governor



MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

July 16, 2007

Lon Thomas Star Stone Quarries, Inc. 4040 south 300 West Salt Lake City, UT 84107

Subject: Review of Amended Notice of Intention to Commence Large Mining Operations, Star

Stone Quarries, Inc., Peoa Blonde Quarry, M/043/012, Task ID# 1844, Summit

County, Utah

Dear Mr. Thomas:

The Division has completed a review of your proposed amendment for the Peoa Blonde Quarry, received June 12, 2007. After reviewing the information, the Division has the following comments, which need to be addressed before tentative approval may be granted.

The comments are listed below under the applicable Minerals Rule heading. Please address only those items requested in the attached technical review. Send replacement pages of the original notice using redline and strikeout text and indicate how these are to be incorporated into the current approved plan using the attached Form-MR-REV-att.

The Division requests that submittals are made according to the following format. Notices and changes should be three hole punched, maps folded and placed in a plastic 8 ½ by 11 sleeve, and binders provided for new notices, revisions, applications, or other changes of 30 pages or more (binders need only be provided once). Applications should not be bound.

If you have any questions in this regard please contact me at (801) 538-5258 or Lynn Kunzler at 538-5310. If you wish to discuss this review, please contact us at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this permitting action. In reply, please refer to file number M/043/012

Sincerely,

Susan M. White

Mining Program Coordinator Minerals Regulatory Program

Haddock

SMW:lk:sb
Attachment: Review
cc: Summit County
O:\M043-Summit\M0430012-PeoaQuarry\Draft\AmendReview-07122007.doc
O:\LMO-REV#2



INITIAL REVIEW OF NOTICE OF INTENTION TO COMMENCE LARGE MINING OPERATIONS

Star Stone Quarries, Inc. Peoa Blonde Quarry

> M/043/012 July 16, 2007

R647-4-104 - Filing Requirements and Review Procedures

According to Form MR-REV, wording to various sections was to be added. It is not the Division's responsibility to add the revised wording to your Notice. Hence, we ask for replacement pages with the revised wording in red-line/strike-out to assist in knowing what the proposed changes are. Since evidently your copy of the Notice has conflicting pages, it may be easiest to provide the complete text of the NOI with the proposed changes for this amendment highlighted (and with page numbers) to avoid this problem. Once the Division is ready to approve the amendment, two clean copies will need to be submitted. Upon approval, they will be stamped approved, and one copy will be returned to you for your records.

While the submittal is not in proper format to insert into the Notice, the following comments do address the deficiencies of the proposed amendment as discussed in your letter. Please address these comments as you revise the text of your Notice.

R647-4-105 - Maps, Drawings & Photographs

105.2 Surface facilities map

Surface Map #8 does not show the same permit boundary as previously approved. If the permit boundary will be revised with this amendment, all other maps showing the permit boundary need to be revised as well. (lk)

The map provided does not show/identify the areas for which variances are being requested, or areas for the alternative post-mining land use. Please show the location and extent of these features. (lk)

105.3 Drawings or Cross Sections (slopes, roads, pads, etc.)
Please provide cross sections and a profile of the new access road. (lk)

R647-4-106 - Operation Plan

106.3 Estimated acreages disturbed, reclaimed, annually.

The current permit is approved for a total of 25.7 acres. Is the intent of this amendment to add an additional 2 acres to the approved acreage (total of 27.7 acres), or to increase the permit area by only 0.6 acres to the stated 26.3 acres? Please show the location(s) on the permit area map of all areas that are proposed to be added with this amendment. (lk)

Page 3 of 4 Initial Review M/043/012 July 16, 2007

All mining related disturbances (roads, highwalls, disturbed areas for alternative post mining land uses, etc.) are considered part of the permit (disturbed area) and the acreage is not subtracted from the total disturbed area simply because you have applied for, or obtained a special use permit from Summit County. In fact, several counties require any mining operation to have a special use permit from their county. Areas are removed from the permit only after reclamation is determined to be completed and successful, and that the area(s) meet the needs of the approved post mining land use. (lk)

R647-4-110 - Reclamation Plan

110.1 Current & post mining land use

This section is confusing as to what your intent is. First of all, it appears you propose to remove the conditional use permit (appendix #5) and then the discussion continues as if the conditional use permit is to remain. As stated previously, the area for the alternative post mining land use is not shown on the map. What is shown conflicts with the text you

post mining land use is not shown on the map. What is shown conflicts with the text you have provided for this section. For example, the proposed new access ramp is about 0.5 acres, yet the text states, "the portion of the access road within the applied for Conditional Use Permit is 11.1 acres..."

110.2 Roads, highwalls, slopes, drainages, pits, etc., reclaimed Please provide a reclamation plan for the new access road (refer to comments under R647-4-112). (lk)

R647-4-111 - Reclamation Practices

111.8 All roads & pads reclaimed
Refer to comments under R647-4-110.

R647-4-112 - Variance

It appears that the operator is requesting a two-part variance from Rule R647-4-111.8, reclamation of roads. Part 1 is to leave a 20' wide road through the property vs. the previously approved 12-foot wide road. The previously approved variance was based, in part to replace a pre-existing 2-track road that accessed this property, and the 12-foot width was deemed appropriate. This current request to widen the road does not provide sufficient justification for the variance, nor does it provide alternate methods or measures to demonstrate that leaving a wider road is consistent with the act. Part 2 is to leave the additional access road. The operator claims that this is required by Summit County for safety purposes, but has provided no documentation to validate this claim. As with part 1, the requested variance does not provide sufficient justification for this variance.

Page 4 of 4 Initial Review M/043/012 July 16, 2007

Current Division practice with regards to leaving mining related disturbances, facilities or structures for post-mining land use is to acknowledge the concept, but not approve the variance until the end of mine life. This is to assure that the facilities, structures, etc. are in a usable condition, are necessary for the post mining land use, and meet the local zoning/land use policies. Therefore, reclamation plans and appropriate reclamation surety must be provided for all structures, facilities, disturbances, etc. At end of mine life, structures, facilities, etc. needed for the approved post mining land use, may be granted a variance from reclamation and be permitted to remain. (lk)

R647-4-113 - Surety

Once acceptable reclamation plans are provided for this amendment, the reclamation surety for the Peoa Blonde Quarry will need to be adjusted to include reclamation costs for these facilities prior to the Division approving this amendment. (lk)